

**MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

PLANNER STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS



**MAG REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
PLANNER STAKEHOLDER**

INTERVIEWS

DECEMBER

2001



CONTENTS

Apache Junction

Arizona Municipal Water Users Association

Arizona State Land Department

Avondale

Buckeye

Bureau of Land Management

Chandler

Fort McDowell Indian Community

Gila River Indian Community

Gilbert

Glendale

Goodyear

Mesa

Peoria

Phoenix

Queen Creek

Salt River Indian Community

Scottsdale

Surprise

Tempe

Tolleson

Tonto National Forest Service

Summary Matrix

MEETING NOTES

Date: September 5, 2001

Agency: City of Apache Junction
1001 North Idaho Rd.
Apache Junction, AZ 85219

Subject: Local Planning re: MAG RTP

Attendees: Dean Svoboda, Dev. Services Director, City of Apache Junction.
John Petroff, Dev. Services Mgr., City
Rudy Esquivas, Zoning Administrator, City
Randall Overmyer, BRW

Community Development Profile

- Current population of 31,000.
- Community in transition from seasonal residents in substandard housing to year-round community.
- Still a rural community in culture and values.
- Many "pre-existing non-conforming uses"
- Flood control easements holding up development of much State Trust Land

Activity Centers

- Limited local; new Super Walmart on old dog track property.
- Redevelopment of Williams Gateway and the GM property very important to Apache Junction; very supportive of employment use on GM lands, far east Valley needs jobs to balance the housing which exists.

Transportation Corridors

- US 60
- Potential change in roadway alignment for US 60 east of Apache Junction may spur new development in that corridor
- AJ expects the US 60/SR202 confluence to generate new activity.
- Ironwood should be major route of regional significance south to Queen Creek & Hunt Highway.



MEETING NOTES

Date/Time: 17 July 2001, 9:00 AM

Location: **Arizona Municipal Water Users Association (AMWUA)**
4041 North Central Avenue, Suite 900
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Subject: Maricopa Association of Governments' Regional Transportation Plan (MAG RTP)

Attendees: Roger Manning, AMWUA
Dave French, URS
Brian Sands, BRW

Copy: Eric Anderson, MAG
Dave French, URS
Dan Marum, BRW
Celeste Werner, BRW

Following a review of the MAG RTP process by Dave French, Roger Manning, Executive Director of the AMWUA, started by reviewing major development issues related to potable water resources in the MAG Region:

To date, growth in Maricopa County has effectively ignored water as a limiting factor.

Total Central Arizona Project (CAP) water could support an urban population of 15-20 million persons.

In the future, the quantity of growth will not be limited by water, but the geographic distribution of growth will be increasingly affected by water.

For reference purposes, the following are a few useful water use approximations:

Water costs are comprised of two components (1) infrastructure costs to get the water to a location and (2) treatment costs making it usable.

Raw CAP water costs approximately \$108 acre feet per year (AFY). The Ak Chin Indian Community's allocation of CAP water costs \$3,000-5,000 AFY to buy (as Del Webb did to supply the Anthem Master Planned Community), plus distribution and treatment costs.

Raw SRP water costs approximately \$9.50 AFY, among the cheapest water in the United States.

1,000 AFY is enough to supply 1,500-2,000 households for a year at 2.7 to 4.0 persons per household.

Total average municipal water usage (including both residential and industrial users) is approximately 250 gallons/person/day in the region.

A household of four uses approximately 0.5-0.6 AFY.

The major factors contributing to water's increasing affect on the geographic distribution of growth in Maricopa County:

1. Physical Limits: Underground water is not available in many areas due to underlying rock (e.g. northwest Peoria, north Scottsdale, Cave Creek, Carefree) and the expense of extending pipelines may be prohibitive in some areas (e.g. Cave Creek).
2. Quality Constraints: Some areas have water which is high in nitrates and/or solids (i.e. salt), primarily due to the use of fertilizers and waterflushing techniques by farmers. Pollution plumes are also an increasing problem due to water accumulation near the surface.
3. Laws: Federal and state laws regarding water use and quality are becoming stricter and are better enforced.
4. Surface Watershed Constraints: Salt River Project (SRP) water (approx. one million acre feet per year) cannot be transported outside of the SRP watershed.
5. Central Arizona Project (CAP) Limits: There are numerous constraints related to CAP water, including the following: the supply is finite (approx. 1.5 million acre feet per year); it is under federal control; allocation of CAP water to user groups was based on population projections from the 1980s (which were woefully below actual population); some potential users did pursue CAP allocations and may now have to buy water at a very high price; and conflicts are likely to increase between CAP water user groups, as well as between CAP and other Colorado River water users.

Further characteristics related to the CAP include the following:

Supply comes from the Colorado River, with approximately one-half of the rights going to the Yuma Water District, mainly for agricultural use, and the other half going to the CAP.

The priority of supply, in descending order, is as follows:

1. Ak Chin Indian Community
2. Other Indian Communities
3. Municipal and industrial users
4. Agricultural users
5. Replenishment
6. Arizona Water Bank

Presently, the CAP supplies approximately 1.5 million acre feet per year (AFY). This could potentially be increased to 2.1 million AFY at 100 percent utilization and using careful regulation techniques on Lake Pleasant (the primary reservoir for the CAP).

CAP capacity could be boosted to 2.3 million AFY if additional freeboard were added to the CAP, however, this would entail a major legal battle with Yuma.

Additional constraints to additional water use from the Colorado River include growing pressure to increase water discharge south of Parker Dam for habitat recharge and additional discharge to Mexico (beyond the current 1.4 million AFY) to recharge the Colorado Delta.

The break-even supply point on the CAP is approximately Mesa. Presently, areas upstream of this point (west of Mesa) are subsidizing areas east of this point. A more accurate cost/price relationship is likely to be imposed in the future.

Water constraints which appear to be facing municipalities in Maricopa County (the Phoenix Active Management Area or AMA) include the following:

Safe yield is being practiced with in the Phoenix AMA, meaning that no more water can be taken out of the ground than can be recharged. This requires municipalities to obtain additional water supplies from the CAP or SRP.

Peoria may be 20,000 AFY short based on their updated General Plan.

Cave Creek and Carefree have no local water supply (due to underlying rock) and no CAP allocation. Currently, water is supplied by a private water company which has limited supply and imposes usage limits during the summer. The City of Phoenix recently extended a pipeline along Cave Creek Road, but neither Cave Creek nor Carefree could afford to participate.

North Scottsdale also has water supply problems, although these are likely to be ameliorated by the financial abilities of the residents to pay.

Buckeye has some groundwater supplies, although these must be recharged. A growing problem are total dissolved solids (TSDs) which are high (i.e. salts) which imposes high water quality costs.

Apache Junction has only a minor CAP allocation and is pumping groundwater, which it will soon have to begin recharging

Chandler has a rising water table.

Gilbert's water is high in nitrates and TSDs.

El Mirage's water is high in nitrates.

Recent and existing claims to CAP water include the following:

Gila River Indian Community (GRIC): A settlement relating to litigation dating back to the 1930s is underway. The case was one of the largest, if not the largest piece of litigation in U.S. history. In addition to fighting for enough water to irrigate practically every acre on the Community, GRIC wants \$80 million to build water distribution infrastructure.

Ak Chin Indian Community: Negotiated preferential water rights to 70,000 AFY. Supply came from the retirement of agricultural land around Yuma.

Salt River-Pima Indian Community: Settled.

Fort McDowell Indian Community: Settled.

Tohono O'odam (Papago) Indian Community (Tucson): Settled, with continued discussions underway.

Hope and Navajo Indian Communities: Currently negotiating for 50,000 AFY.

Tucson: Has existing water rights which are not being utilized currently, but are likely to be utilized in the future.

Reclaimed effluent will become increasingly important and valuable in the future:

This is the largest untapped block of water and will grow in the future.

Cultural perceptions block the use of effluent for potable supply (i.e. drinking water).

Currently, approximately 60 percent of effluent is used for industrial, agricultural and parks/recreation irrigation purposes, with the other 40 percent sent to recharge basins.

New power plants are the major wildcard in the use of effluent and are likely to drive effluent economics in the future:

There are currently 10-20 new power plants in development in Arizona, at an average capacity of around 1,200 mega watts (MW) each, equating to 12,000-24,000 MW of capacity. Some 80 percent of this capacity is likely to be located in Maricopa County, mainly along the I-10 corridor west of Phoenix.

Combined-cycle (CC) technology which utilizes natural gas is the preferred choice.

Water use of power plants (to cool water returning from steam turbines, thereby increasing efficiency) is high, approximately 5,000 AFY per 550 MW.

The impact on the economics of effluent is likely to be significantly impacted by the ability of power plants to pay relatively high rates which will increase costs for competing municipal users.

Power plants are currently paying \$30 AFY for effluent, with inflation escalators on top.

In the Southeast Valley, east of the Maricopa County line, water allocation is likely to become an increasing issue in the future:

The amount of Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) holdings in this area exceeds the supply of water.

Therefore, development in this area is likely to be discontinuous and high priced.

Salt River Project (SRP) is not facing issues of water pricing, but rather of availability:

The raw cost of water within the SRP watershed is low at approximately \$9.50 AFY, which is among the cheapest water in the United States. However, density is increasing within the SRP watershed.

Entitlement to SRP water transfers with the property title, so that those properties with irrigation now will have it indefinitely. However, SRP is increasingly blending rates between those areas with irrigation (and entitlements) and those areas without irrigation and no entitlements. This practice may be legally challenged in the future.

Other points discussed included the following:

Wickenburg is probably a growth sleeper. However, while the quality of water is good in the area, the availability of water from the Hussyampa River may be subject to conflict in the future.

Areas along I-8 south of South Mountain currently have little agriculture which means that they have little water rights and will not have water to supply municipal development in the future.

The Salt River-Pima Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC) is in a very good position to respond to growth pressures due to its location and large water rights.

Areas which appear able to have sufficient water supply to serve growth pressures include the following: Surprise, Peoria, Gilbert, Chandler, Mesa, Laveen, and Goodyear.

The MWUA was pleased to have been consulted regarding future development trends and looks forward to the opportunity to participate further as the MAG RTP process continues.



MEETING NOTES

Date/Time: 16 July 2001, 10:00 AM

Location: **Arizona State Land Department (ASLD)**
1616 West Adams
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Subject: Maricopa Association of Governments' Regional Transportation Plan (MAG RTP)

Attendees: Greg Kellor, ASLD
Gordon Taylor, ASLD
John McNamara, BRW
Brian Sands, BRW

Copy: Eric Anderson, MAG
Dave French, URS
Dan Marum, BRW
Celeste Werner, BRW

Following a review of the MAG RTP process by John McNamara, Greg Kellor, Planner, with the Planning Section in the Real Estate Division of the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), presented the old approach to land sales under the Urban Lands Act:

1. An applicant acquired a holding lease and applied for classification of the property for planning, with consideration given to consistency with the local general plan, potential future availability of infrastructure, location relative to the reasonable path of development within 5-10 years.
2. A planning permit was issued to the leaseholder.
3. A development plan was prepared by the leaseholder, securing amendment of the local general plan (if necessary), and the site was conceptually zoned. The leaseholder's costs were also certified by the ASLD.
4. The property was auctioned by the ASLD, with the stipulation that an approved development plan would be followed, and the leaseholder's costs would be reimbursed if the leaseholder was not the highest bidder.
5. If the highest bidder was not the leaseholder, the leaseholder had the right to match the highest bidder.
6. The land was then leased if to be used for commercial development or sold if to be used for non-commercial development.

Growing Smarter legislation caused a review of the traditional land sales approach by the ASLD, leading to the following:

Increased participation in the local general plan update processes.

Use of ASLD conceptual plans, focusing on highest and best use.

Efforts to get local general plans to reflect ASLD development objectives (i.e. highest and best use).

Internal review with the Urban Oversight Committee.

The ASLD has been using a couple of alternatives to the Urban Lands Act for the last four or five years:

1. Planning and Disposition Process: A developer pays 1-2 percent of the land value as earnest money (which is at risk); the developer attempts to get zoning for the property; if successful in obtaining zoning for the property, the developer pays 10 percent of the value of the property; and the balance of the land value is due upon auction, at which time the developer has a higher probability of having the winning bid than other bidders.
2. Conceptual Planning: ASLD staff and consultants prepare conceptual plans prior to ASLD land sales, with the local general plan functioning as the test of the conceptual plan (e.g. Buckeye, Peoria Camino El Lago). This is the preferred approach and is likely to be utilized extensively in the future (e.g. Mojave County, Prescott Valley, Verde Valley, Lake Havasu City, Flagstaff).

The sale and development of State Land is application driven, with future applications likely to focus on the northwest and southeast portions of the Phoenix Metropolitan Area, specifically in the following areas:

Black Canyon Corridor: Initial development pressure is focusing on the east side of I-17 (e.g. Tramonto, Sun Belt), but is expected to shift to the west side in 10-15 years, where the ASLD has approximately 15,000 acres. This area includes: Lake Pleasant Heights/SR 74 Corridor, Peoria; and Surprise (e.g. Coyote Lakes, Sun City).

Loop 101/Scottsdale Road Area, Phoenix and Scottsdale: Development pressure from Scottsdale Airpark has shifted to the Core South area adjacent to Greyhawk, Desert Ridge, and Paradise Ridge for the next three years, with development of the Core North area expected to continue over the next ten years.

Southeast Area: Offers a multitude of development opportunities, including: Williams Gateway Airport, Mesa; former GM Proving Grounds, Mesa; areas south of U.S. 60 in Apache Junction; and Gold Canyon Ranch area (Pinal County).

Southeast Freeway Corridor: At major interchanges along I-10 from Phoenix to Casa Grande.

The ASLD is very interested in continuing to participate in the MAG RTP, appreciated being included as a regional stakeholder, and asked to be notified of future project activities.

MEETING NOTES

Date: August 24, 2001

Agency: City of Avondale
1211 S. Fourth St.
Avondale, AZ 85323

Subject: Local Planning re: MAG RTP

Attendees: Felipe Zubia, City of Avondale
Nathan Crane, City of Avondale
David Fitzhugh, City of Avondale
John McNamara, BRW
Randall Overmyer, BRW

Community Development Profile

- Population now 36,000
- 100 square mile planning area.
- General Plan adoption slated for 1/2002, with election 5/2002.

Activity Centers

- Phoenix International Raceway. (PIR).
- I-10 corridor. City waives 50% of impact fees to stimulate development in the I-10 corridor area.
- 115th Ave. Corridor.
- Downtown redevelopment area.

Transportation Corridors

- I-10
- 115th Ave. Plans for development of this corridor as a parkway/entry corridor with high design standards.
- SR101/Agua Fria (just east of City)
- Dysart Rd.
- MC 85
- UP rail corridor (future commuter rail?)

Other Issues

- Tres Rios Greenway Plan, and River Recreation Corridor Study. Interest in preservation of riparian habitats.

MEETING NOTES

Date: September 4, 2001

Agency: City of Buckeye
100 North Apache
Buckeye AZ 85326

Subject: Local Planning re: MAG RTP

Attendees: Joe Blanton, Buckeye Town Manager
Randall Overmyer, BRW

Community Development Profile

- Buckeye currently has a population of 6500 (plus 1500 in prison complex).
- Current incorporated area of 508 sq. miles.
- Planning Area of 940 sq. miles.
- Pro-development City Council.
- Buckeye has approved 35 large planned area developments totaling 161,000 housing units and 14 million sq. ft. of commercial floor space. Annexation is pending for another large PAD with 34,000 housing units and 16 million sq. ft. of commercial use (Douglas Ranch)
- If approved projects come to fruition, Buckeye will have a build out population of 1 million plus.
- A number of these large projects are under development now, and will be open within 18-24 months.
- 90% of new housing units will be in large scale developments, each of which will have its own town center.
- Developments are large enough to provide their own infrastructure and community facilities (e.g. schools, fire stations, etc.) Public bonding to accomplish these facilities will not be required.
- "Growing Smarter" General plan update to public 3/2002.

Activity Centers

- Buckeye Airport (potential future west side commuter/reliever)
- Internal centers for major PADs
- Around traffic interchanges of I-10

Transportation Corridors

- I-10 (new interchanges desired at Airport, Watson, Wilson)
- SR 85
- MC 85
- Sun Valley Parkway with Bell Road Connector to SR 303
- Riggs Road
- Wickenburg/Vulture Roads (future Canamex Corridor?)
- Union Pacific Railroad - Spur into airport? Future commuter service?

Other Community Issues

- White Tank Mountains-working with BLM for additional open space
- El Rio Project – 17 miles in Gila floodplain, 10 in Buckeye, riparian protection
- Buckeye Hills Regional Park – transferring to Town from County
- New Sonoran National Monument to south, east of SR 85.
- Budgeting \$250k/yr. for downtown redevelopment and anti-slum task force

MEETING NOTES

Date: September 6, 2001

Agency: Bureau of Land Management
21605 N. 7th Avenue
Phoenix AZ 85027

Subject: Stakeholder Input re: MAG RTP

Attendees: Chris Horyza, BLM
Randall Overmyer, BRW

Agency Profile

- Federal Agency, Department of Interior
- Major Land Owner in Arizona
- Significant portions of newly created national monuments came from BLM holdings.
- The BLM will manage these monuments
- Mission to long term manage resources
- Agency has both major land holdings and smaller scattered holdings. If lands cannot be effectively managed per agency mission they should be disposed of and resources aggregated.

Current Issues

- Currently developing Bradshaw Foothills Area Plan (see attached map) immediately north of Phoenix metropolitan area.
- Area contains a checkerboard of BLM and State Land holdings.
- Development north of SR 74 poses a risk to viability of these land being preserved in natural state. They view SR 74 as a "line in the sand".

Policy Implications

- BLM strongly supports legislation which would permit trading of state lands with other public agencies; and sees such legislation enabling parcel assembly of areas meaningful for both development and preservation.
- BLM is frustrated by attempting planning in areas with multiple jurisdictions (e.g., Bradshaw Foothills involves both Yavapai and Maricopa Counties) and wishes they could coordinate with a "Super MAG" (OEPAD??).

Transportation Impacts

- BLM is concerned about rural development in “checkerboard” area, requiring multiple access routes, usually unpaved, through public use areas.
- They are trying to look at an even longer horizon for management of their resources, and are concerned about ultimate development pressures far beyond current urbanized boundaries.

MEETING NOTES

Date: August 23, 2001

Agency: City of Chandler
215 E. Buffalo St.
Chandler AZ 85225

Subject: Local Planning re: MAG RTP

Attendees: Bob Pazera, Chandler Planning Dept,
Claudia Whitehead, Chandler Econ. Dev. Dir.
John McNamara, BRW
Randall Overmyer, BRW

Community Development Profile

- Population now at 176,000.
- Build-out will be about 260,000
- "Growing Smarter" General plan to public vote 3/2002.
- Mall to open @ SR101/Chandler Blvd, 10/01. 5 anchor.
- Continued growth of high-tech employment
- Redevelopment District in downtown area.
- Enterprise Zone including all of Downtown and Airpark.
- City Campus Master Plan adopted

Activity Centers

- South Price Road Campus (anchored by Intel)
- I-10/Ray Rd. Retail Hub
- Chandler Fashion Center Mall
- Downtown
- Chandler Airpark: last major "economic development frontier" (needs a "trigger" project to coincide with SR 202/San Tan freeway opening)

Transportation Corridors & Issues

- SR 101 Price Freeway (seen as economic development corridor linking Chandler and Scottsdale Airparks)
- Price Road (south of SR 101)
- Chandler Blvd.
- Future SR 202/San Tan freeway
- Extension of grid system

- Current Transit Plan update underway, as well as MIS to evaluate the potential of high capacity transit in Chandler, including LRT, commuter rail.
- Interest in connecting to Central Phoenix/East Valley LRT system.

Other Community Issues

- Freeway Construction on SR202
- Affordable Housing
- Stabilizing and revitalizing older areas

MEETING NOTES

Date: August 28, 2001

Agency: Fort McDowell Indian Community
17661 E. Yavapai Rd.
Ft. McDowell, AZ 85265

Subject: Local Planning re: MAG RTP

Attendees: Norm Phillips, Planning & Economic Development Dir.
Dan Marum, BRW
Randall Overmyer, BRW

Community Profile

- Community population is 824. This is expected to double within ten years due to birth rate and returning tribal members from areas outside the community.
- Casino revenues have fallen 30% due to competition from new SRPMIC and GRIC casinos. (Still yield \$70m /yr.)

Activity Centers

- Casino. Tribe would like to built a new, more upscale facility.
- Verde River recreation area
- Potential development at Shea/SR 87 intersection
- Proposed new destination resort w/ golf course

Transportation Corridors

- SR 87
- Shea Blvd. (Tribe controls 2/3 of intersection)
- Would like to see a new north/south roadway corridor connecting SR 87 to the Red Mountain Freeway.

Other Community Issues

- Preservation of Riparian areas along Verde River, Sycamore Creek.
- Diversify economic base to reduce dependence on gaming.



MEETING NOTES

Date/Time: 10 August 2001, 3:00 PM

Location: **Gila River Indian Community (GRIC)**
Tribal Government Building
315 W. Casablanca Road
Sacaton, AZ

Subject: Maricopa Association of Governments' Regional Transportation Plan (MAG RTP)

Attendees: Dean Weatherly, GRIC
Larry K. Stephenson, GRIC
Dan Marum, BRW

Copy: Eric Anderson, MAG
Dave French, URS
John McNamara, BRW
Brian Sands, BRW
Celeste Werner, BRW

Following a review of the MAG RTP process by Dan Marum, Dean Weatherly, Director of the Economic Development Department of the Gila River Indian Community, described recent activities affecting development at the GRIC:

No land use or general plan exists for GRIC. The *Gila Borderlands Regional Planning Study* from 1998 is the most recent land use study. An update of this study is underway, but is moving slowly. Outreach is underway to adjacent municipalities to review land use compatibility, transportation, and communication networks.

The Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area boundary has been shifted to the south due to development in Pinal County.

No new residential development is to be allowed on the GRIC. However, major residential developments are occurring around GRIC, including the following: Sun Lakes, located north of GRIC between I-10 and SR-87, south of Chandler; El Dorado Estates Phase II, the largest residential development in Pinal County, located near Maricopa, east of intersection of SR-347 and SR-238; Copper Mountain, located west of intersection of intersection of I-10 and SR-387; Johnson Ranch, located near northeastern corner of GRIC; and near Florence.

Commercial development on the GRIC is to be limited to within one mile around the edges and along key transportation corridors.

The Lone Butte Industrial Park, located southwest of the intersection of I-10 and Maricopa Road, could have up to 10,000 new jobs by 2010.

In addition to development activities, a number of transportation-related activities are underway or consideration:

GRIC is concerned with the transportation corridors through the community connecting to Pinal County. Development of the CANAMEX south of GRIC is also of concern. As a result, GRIC is seeking to increase planning and coordination with public agencies (e.g., ADOT, DPS).

Paving is underway on SR-238 south of GRIC to Gila Bend.

Potential exists for a new intersection of SR-347 and I-8 south of GRIC.

CH2M Hill are currently completing a study regarding the widening of I-10 south from Phoenix to I-8. However, right-of-way constraints exist on I-10 within GRIC south of Riggs Road.

While north-south corridors across GRIC are set, east-west corridors have yet to be fully developed. For example, consideration is underway to the upgrading of the Hunt Highway across GRIC.

Potential exists for extension of the Loop 101 south to I-10 along the GRIC/Chandler border.

BRW completed the *North Central Area Traffic Study* in 1997, focusing on the area around the intersection of I-10 and the future Santan Freeway alignment.

The GRIC is very interested in continuing to participate in the MAG RTP, appreciated being included as a regional stakeholder, and asked to be notified of future project activities. GRIC also asked to review the growth concept alternatives

MEETING NOTES

Date: August 23, 2001

Agency: Town of Gilbert
1025 S. Gilbert Rd.
Gilbert, AZ 85296

Subject: Local Planning re: MAG RTP

Attendees: Jerry Swanson, Town of Gilbert
Carl Harris-Morgan, Town of Gilbert
Linda Edwards, Town of Gilbert
John McNamara, BRW
Randall Overmyer, BRW

Community Development Profile

- Population now exceeding 110,000
- Numerous large projects awaiting SR202/San Tan Freeway.
- Community densifying, moving from rural to suburban character.
- Heritage District redevelopment plan in downtown area: close to street, pedestrian scale no condemnation, city "landbanking" voluntary sales.
- New General Plan adopted 7/01, to voters 11/01. No major controversy.
- Over two-thirds of town already entitled through zoning approvals.
- IGAs between counties may be necessary to address system impacts of boundary area growth

Activity Centers

- Downtown Heritage District
- Crossroads Mall (Westcor, @ Williams Field Rd./Greenfield) (future)
- Gateway Center (future)
- Williams Gateway complex and GM proving ground site in Mesa seen as major regional draw once freeway is in.

Transportation Corridors

- US 60/Superstition Freeway
- SR 202/San Tan Freeway (future)
- Transit Center Site in downtown Heritage District near railroad corridor
- Potential commuter rail?

- Need two new major routes from San Tan freeway to developing Pinal County areas to the southeast, and to Gila River Indian Community areas to south.
- Trails system focusing on canals, power lines and San Tan corridor.

MEETING NOTES

Date: September 4, 2001

Agency: City of Glendale
5850 E. Glendale Ave.
Glendale, AZ 85301

Subject: Local Planning re: MAG RTP

Attendees: Ron Short, City of Glendale
Ray Jacobs, City of Glendale
Randall Overmyer, BRW

Community Development Profile

- Glendale has a current population of 211,000
- A build-out population of 305,000 is foreseen
- Alternatives are being finalized for a General Plan update to go to the voters in November, 2002.
- Glendale has just completed a transportation plan looking at major improvements if a November, 2001 sales tax election is successful.
- Recently completed SR 101/Agua Fria freeway is expanding development interest in Glendale locations near that corridor

Activity Centers

- Arrowhead Town Center
- Downtown
- Glendale Airpark
- Ellman/Coyotes Complex (future)
- Luke AFB
- Manistee Center (redevelopment pending)

Transportation Corridors

- SR 101/Agua Fria
- Glendale Avenue
- Bell Road
- Northern Avenue (current plans call for improvement to "superstreet" parkway west to SR 303)
- SR 303 (future)

- LRT extension from 19th Avenue in Phoenix to downtown Glendale (specific alignment to be determined)

Other Community Issues

- City very concerned about retention of Luke Air Force Base, which contributes heavily to local (and regional) economy. It could be threatened by budgetary base closures and encroachment of non-compatible urban land uses.
- Western portion of Planning Area is unincorporated, and may be developing, not in accord with Glendale standards.
- City is concerned about jobs/housing balance
- Downtown preservation and revitalization.
- Increased throughput traffic from faster developing exurban areas will contribute to congestion in Glendale.
- Need to match recent transit service improvements in Phoenix for continuity of service.

MEETING NOTES

Date: August 22, 2001

Agency: City of Goodyear
190 N. Litchfield Rd.
Goodyear, AZ 85338

Subject: Local Planning re: MAG RTP

Attendees: Harvey Krause, City of Goodyear
John McNamara, BRW
Randall Overmyer, BRW

Community Development Profile

- Population now 22,000.
- 1089 residential permits issued in 2000; exceeded that by June, 2001.
- About 10,000 pre-approved units in "pipeline" (primarily Pebble Creek, Palm Valley & Estrella Mountain Ranch).
- Sunchase Estrella project is 20,000 acres, being replanned as an urban village approach; 64,000 dwelling maximum.
- General Plan revision slated for 12/02.

Activity Centers

- Planned Westcor Mall near Bullard/I-10.
- City Center site (build a "downtown").
- Goodyear Airport area.

Transportation Corridors

- I-10
- SR303
- Estrella Parkway
- Cotton Lane
- Van Buren
- Yuma Rd.
- Indian School
- McDowell
- UP Rail corridor (future potential?)

Other Issues

- Luke Air Force Base major economic engine for SW Valley.
- Both jobs and housing link.
- Luke preservation will be major General Plan issue.
- City not inclined to do any major annexations; just clean up some County parcels.

MEETING NOTES

Date: September 5 2001

Agency: City of Mesa
55 N. Center
Mesa, AZ 85211

Subject: Local Planning re: MAG RTP

Attendees: Frank Mizner, City of Mesa
Anne Blech, City of Mesa
John McNamara, BRW
Randall Overmyer, BRW

Community Development Profile

- General Plan under development.
- Biggest issue is jobs per capita. Mesa is a labor exporter, currently .36 jobs/capita.
- Hope to address this by using GM proving ground site as employment center; but GM can get cash now for housing.
- Extension of the Red Mountain and San Tan freeways will spur development in areas where the infrastructure (esp. arterial streets and utilities) may not yet be up to the task.
- Mesa is simultaneously experiencing both infill and peripheral development.
- One-fourth of Mesa-an area the size of Tempe-is vacant.
- Potential March 2002 election for General Plan approval.

Activity Centers

- Superstition Springs.
- Fiesta Mall
- Williams Gateway complex and GM proving ground site not just a Mesa, but a major regional draw once SR202 freeway is in.
- Falcon Field employment area.
- Downtown Mesa, Civic Center area
- SR202/US60 "Confluence" area (future
- SR202/SR101 "Confluence" area.

Transportation Corridors

- US 60/Superstition Freeway
- SR 202/ Red Mountain and San Tan Freeways (future)
- Working with ADOT to accelerate schedule for SR202.
- LRT corridor to EVIT and downtown.
- Potential cross-river N/S corridor to Beeline (SR87).
- Need new major route to Pinal County developing areas, east of Williams Gateway.

Other Issues

- Infrastructure is a key issue in Southeast valley.
- A tri-city wastewater plant is needed in the Williams Gateway area, to serve Williams Gateway, Gm, Queen Creek and parts of Gilbert. NIMBY issue-who wants it??

MEETING NOTES

Date: September 7, 2001

Agency: City of Peoria
8401 West Monroe
Peoria, AZ 85345

Subject: Local Planning re: MAG RTP

Attendees: Debra Stark, City of Peoria
Randall Overmyer, BRW

Community Development Profile

- Population now over 108,000.
- Build-out will be about 487,000
- "Growing Smarter" General plan to public vote 12/2001.
- City seeking to expand employment opportunities, retail, balance previous bedroom community.
- New and expanded transportation corridors, Lake Pleasant, and Luke AFB all keys to future.
- About 24,000 housing units in "pipeline".

Activity Centers

- Bell/Sports Complex
- Bell Road retail (across from Arrowhead, power centers)
- Old Town/City Complex
- Grand Avenue
- Future employment core west of Lake Pleasant Road, south of the CAP canal.

Transportation Corridors & Issues

- SR 101 Agua Fria
- Grand Avenue
- Lake Pleasant Road (future parkway, main corridor to SR 74 and Lake Pleasant)
- SR 303 (future)
- Bell Road
- Bell link to Sun Valley Parkway (future)
- SR 74

Other Community Issues

- Economic Development to assure better jobs/housing balance.
- Public Lands status, especially north of SR 74.
- What adjacent communities are considering about transit improvements.
- Long term status of Grand Avenue.
- Location of Canamex trade corridor

MEETING NOTES

Date: September 7, 2001

Agency: City of Phoenix
200 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85003

Subject: Local Planning re: MAG RTP

Attendees: Joy Mee, City of Phoenix
Mark Steele, City of Phoenix
Tim Tilton, City of Phoenix
John McNamara, BRW
Randall Overmyer, BRW

Community Development Profile

- Six major growth areas
 - North Black Canyon
 - Desert View
 - Estrella (primarily residential)
 - Laveen (primarily residential)
 - Baseline (primarily residential w/ mixed use)
 - Infill
- The SR101-Agua Fria area will be a major employment area.
- Areas south of South Mountain will be built out in 10 years.
- New General Plan to voters in spring 2002
- Interest high in Rio Salado, urban heat dome, environmental and quality of life issues.
- Redevelopment focusing around LRT stations, airport area.
- Concern about impacts of growth, must pay own way
- Infill housing and increased densities
- Accessibility and mobility becoming more important

Activity Centers

- Downtown
- LRT corridor
- Airport area
- Camelback Corridor
- Black Canyon

- SR 101/Agua Fria (around John F. Long property, future,)
- SR 202/South Mountain (future)

Transportation Corridors

- LRT
- SR 101/Agua Fria
- North Black Canyon
- SR202/South Mountain (future)
- SR101/Pima, Desert Ridge and Deer Valley areas

Other Community Issues

- Expanded transit service
- Job/Housing balance
- Redevelopment/Infill
- Village Planning Concept

MEETING NOTES

Date: August 23, 2001

Agency: Town of Queen Creek
22350 S. Ellsworth Rd.
Queen Creek, AZ 85242

Subject: Local Planning re: MAG RTP

Attendees: John Kross, Planning Dir. Town of Queen Creek
John McNamara, BRW
Randall Overmyer, BRW

Community Development Profile

- About 10,000 dwellings now in “pipeline”.
- Numerous water and irrigation companies.
- Town water and sewer infrastructure not positioned to support adjacent growth in Pinal County.
- Adjacent “Johnson Ranch” PUD in Pinal County, 4500 acres.
- Town has not annexed most roadways, needs tax revenues to support infrastructure.
- Concerned about sales tax “leakage” to Gilbert
- Needs to develop retail and services to support housing.
- Strongly supportive of employment based uses at Williams Gateway and GM proving ground site, to provide jobs for East Valley.
- Most residents want to preserve small town/rural/agricultural lifestyle.
- General Plan update to Council in May, 2002; election November, 2002.

Activity Centers

- Nearby Williams Gateway and potential GM site (future)
- “Town Center” redevelopment
- Power Road corridor (future)
- Schneff Farms-potential expansion of “entertainment farming” w/ festivals, corporate retreats, “early days Knott’s Berry Farm” concept.

Transportation Corridors & Issues

- Power Road

- Riggs Road
- Germann road
- Ellsworth
- Vinyard (section line road 1 mile east of Meridian)
- Strong interest in commuter rail on UP track connecting to Gilbert, Mesa, Tempe and LRT corridor.

Other Community Issues

- San Tan Regional Park, (protection, vandalism problems).
- Consolidation of water infrastructure.
- Expansion of tax base.
- Public support of low density, rural lifestyle vs. large landowners who want to “cash in”.



MEETING NOTES

Date/Time: 26 July 2001, 10:00 AM

Location: **Salt River-Pima Indian Community (SRPIC)**
Main Administration Building
10005 East Osborn Road
Scottsdale, AZ 85256

Subject: Maricopa Association of Governments' Regional Transportation Plan (MAG RTP)

Attendees: David Eschief, SRPIC
Hans Klose, SRPIC
Jacob Moore, SRPIC
Brian Sands, BRW

Copy: Eric Anderson, MAG
Dave French, URS
Dan Marum, BRW
Celeste Werner, BRW

Following a review of the MAG RTP process by Brian Sands, David Eschief reviewed development issues related to the Salt River-Pima Indian Community (SRPIC or Community):

Population growth is limited by enrollment in the tribe, with only community members allowed to reside in the Community.

Commuter traffic across the community (e.g. from Mesa to Scottsdale) is currently a major issue and is an increasing problem as population continues to grow in the surrounding communities.

Conflicts exist with Maricopa County regarding road improvements, due to the fact that the County is responsible for development and maintenance of the roads, but the County resists upgrading roads due to their location on Community property.

Non-residential development within the Community is a slow process by typical development standards due to distrust by many members of the Community of outside developers, the land ownership structure (tribal and/or allotted lands), the inability of developers to purchase land (lease only), and the involvement of numerous parties, including the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), tribe, lessor, lessee.

The 1988 General Plan, which is currently being updated, focused on maintaining rural land use and sightlines to the sacred mountains.

Changes likely in the General Plan include the following:

Commercial land use along the northern border (paralleling Shea Boulevard) is likely to be changed to agricultural use due to the fact that it has no access.

Higher densities in the area of Via Ventura, between the Pima/Loop 101 Freeway and Pima Road (near Pavillion Lakes Golf Club), with a mix of commercial and industrial development in this area. Development may also possibly be allowed east of the SR 101 Freeway in this area.

Other comments included the following:

Consideration should be given to locating a north-south light rail transit (LRT) corridor on Community lands parallel to the Pima/Loop 101 Freeway.

Future commercial and industrial development opportunities may exist around the intersection of the Pima/Loop 101 Freeway and the Loop 202 Freeway in the southwestern corner of the Community.

Community members are beginning to realize that gaming (i.e. casinos) may no longer be possible and that the Community will have to turn to other revenue sources, such as development, to fund infrastructure and service programs.

The SRPMIC appreciated being consulted and would like to be informed of further activities as the MAG RTP project moves forward.

MEETING NOTES

Date: September 6, 2001

Agency: City of Scottsdale
3939 N. Drinkwater Plaza
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

Subject: Local Planning re: MAG RTP

Attendees: Don Hadder, City of Scottsdale
Theresa Huish, City of Scottsdale
John McNamara, BRW

Community Development Profile

- March 2002 election for General Plan approval.
- Development Status of remaining state Trust Lands is major GP issue.
- Affordable housing advocates are pushing for strong Housing Element in Plan; staff concerned that issue could threaten plan adoption.
- Major new developments north of Deer Valley Rd will be very low density, custom homes, equestrian related, very little commercial.
- South of Deer Valley, focus will be on infill and build-out of existing projects
- Decline may build community support for redevelopment activities in southern and downtown locales.

Activity Centers

- Downtown and Fashion Square: balance of redevelopment will be scaled back to be economically viable.
- Scottsdale/Shea (three of four corners will redevelop to some degree. Ownership patterns-small parcels-complicate this, especially Southeast corner).
- Scottsdale Airpark/Sonoran Core: strong retail and employment; may well be region's #1 employment center by 2005. Strong land values have led to start of teardowns among older front office/back warehouse structures.
- McCormick Ranch Center (92nd/Shea): medical complex growth.
- Los Arcos: Redevelopment with potential retail, residential.
- Employment corridor along SR 101.

Transportation Corridors

- SR 101
- Potential north/south LRT corridor connecting to Tempe. MIS study underway.
- Potential cross-river E/W corridor to Beeline (SR87) at or near the Dynamite road alignment. A previous study was derailed by environmental groups and the Rio Verde community.
- Potential SR 303 extension east of I-17.
- Region needs an east/west corridor from Scottsdale to Glendale,

Other Issues

- Development of Salt River properties adjacent to SR101 corridor.
- Deterioration of multi-family residential/resort units in mature parts of the community. Most are no longer positioned toward the seasonal resident. Many are poorly maintained.

MEETING NOTES

Date: August 24, 2001

Agency: City of Surprise
12425 W. Bell Rd.
Surprise, AZ 85374

Subject: Local Planning re: MAG RTP

Attendees: Phil Testa, City of Surprise
John McNamara, BRW
Randall Overmyer, BRW

Community Development Profile

- Surprise currently has a population of 31,000.
- The community needs jobs, retail and services to balance the predominantly residential development that has occurred there.
- A major component of Surprise' residential development is Sun City Grand, an age restricted community.
- Surprise has a great deal of State Trust Lands.

Activity Centers

- Surprise Center-future development bounded by Bell, Greenway, Bullard and Litchfield roads.
- Future spring training sports arena for Kansas City Royals and Texas Rangers
- Luke AFB, (Surprise within Luke influence area)
- Volvo proving ground
- Municipal Complex

Transportation Corridors

- Grand Avenue (near or at capacity)
- Bell Road
- SR 303 (future)
- Connection from Sun Valley Parkway to Bell Rd.

Other Community Issues

- White Tank Mountain preservation

- City concerned about retention of Luke Air Force Base.
- City would like to see transit extended, but without regional funds, how to get past bottleneck of unincorporated Sun Cities area?

MEETING NOTES

Date: September 6, 2001

Agency: City of Tempe
31 E. 5th St.
Tempe, AZ 85281

Subject: Local Planning re: MAG RTP

Attendees: Diana Kaminski, City of Tempe
Neil Calfee, City of Tempe
John McNamara, BRW

Community Development Profile

- Tempe is landlocked, and the future growth will be based on infill and redevelopment.
- Tempe will continue to densify.
- Build out population is estimated at 350,000, compared to a current population of 158,000.
- Tempe's development is linked to a number of regional issues, as it is located at the junction of travel between the central and east valley areas.
- General Plan revisions are to be completed during 2002.
- The urban core is north of Broadway, with suburban residential to the south. Modest densification of the area between Broadway and Us60 will occur over the next 20 years.

Activity Centers

- Central Business District (Mill) & Rio Salado.
- ASU Campus
- ASU Research Park (65% built out)
- I-10 corridor south (including Arizona Mills)
- Apache Boulevard redevelopment, along LRT

Transportation Corridors

- I-10
- US60
- SR 202

- SR 101
- LRT corridor connecting to Mesa and Phoenix
- MIS study underway for possible N/S LRT corridor extending to Scottsdale.

Other Issues

- Coordination between Maricopa County Community College District and universities.
- Development of Rio Salado/Town Lake area.
- Tempe is very concerned about implementation of the 1994 Regional Aviation System Plan (RASP). (The City is concerned about the impacts of long term expansion and operations increases at Sky Harbor; as they perceive they bear the brunt of the environmental impact as well as potential development restrictions and concomitant revenue loss.)

MEETING NOTES

Date: September 17, 2001

Agency: City of Tolleson
9555 W. Van Buren
Tolleson, AZ 85353

Subject: Local Planning re: MAG RTP

Attendees: Ray Velez, City of Tolleson
Randall Overmyer, BRW

Community Development Profile

- Small community of 6 square miles bordered on three sides by Phoenix.
- Proximity to I-10 has made land valuable for business uses.
- Limited future residential growth, as land is too valuable for housing.
- Most new housing will be multi-family.
- Current population is 5,000, build-out projected as 8,000.
- Current employment is 15,000. Population triples during work hours.
- General Plan update will go to voters in November, 2002.

Activity Centers

- Confluence of I-10/SR 101

Transportation Corridors & Issues

- SR 101 Agua Fria Freeway
- I-10
- Union Pacific Railroad (current commercial activity).
- Union Pacific Railroad (potential use of corridor for commuter service).
- Would like to see an extension of Tempe's Rio Salado Parkway across the Valley.



MEETING NOTES

Date/Time: 13 July 2001, 10:00 AM

Location: **Forest Service, Tonto National Forest (TNF)**
2324 East McDowell Road
Phoenix, AZ 85006

Subject: Maricopa Association of Governments' Regional Transportation Plan (MAG RTP)

Attendees: Tom Klabunde, TNF
Richard Martin, TNF
Karl Siderits, TNF
Carl Taylor, TNF
Donald Van Driel, TNF
John McNamara, BRW
Brian Sands, BRW

Copy: Eric Anderson, MAG
Dave French, URS
Dan Marum, BRW
Celeste Werner, BRW

Following a review of the MAG RTP process by John McNamara, Karl Siderits, Forest Supervisor, who is responsible for the Tonto National Forest, presented an overview of the Tonto National Forest (TNF):

The TNF was created by the federal government in 1905 to protect the Salt River Project (SRP) watershed. SRP had been recently established by area farmers and the federal government.

The TNF is approximately 3,000,000 acres in size, including 1,000,000 acres of Sonoran Desert.

There are an estimated 35 million visitors annually to the TNF (note that this includes visits to urban places such as Globe).

The primary goal of the Forest Service is the conservation of the TNF and the protection of the quality of the experience for users.

The Forest Service is firmly committed to preservation of the TNF, particularly the urban desert areas, via such mechanisms as the MAG Desert Spaces Plan and cooperation with adjacent municipalities (e.g. Scottsdale, Mesa) in terms of open space preservation and recreational development.

The largest challenge currently facing the TNF is preservation of the land along urban boundaries, particularly as the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) sells

property, causing difficult users (e.g. ATVs, four-wheel drive vehicles, gun shooters, desert parties) to move to the TNF which has limited law enforcement resources.

The second largest challenge is marketing the TNF to tourists, not just local residents.

In terms of the urban boundary areas, the following issues are particularly pressing in the TNF:

Balancing various user groups (e.g. ATVs vs. recreational shooters vs. hikers vs. bikers vs. equestrians).

Recreational development is active and can guide users via the provision of facilities (e.g. picnic benches, toilets, trash receptacles), but have capital and operating costs.

Law enforcement capabilities are currently already completely overrun.

The treatment of roads and highways in the TNF is also a point of concern:

Possible connections from the Usury and Bush Highways to the Beeline Highway are under consideration.

An extension of Dynamite Boulevard to the Beeline Highway has been discussed regularly in the past.

A new highway parallel to the I-17 north of Phoenix is also in discussion.

There are also concerns about the impact of further widening and improvements to U.S. 60.

The Forest Service has the ability to make land exchanges, but land sales can only be made to cities and towns:

Approximately 880 acres of land between Goldfield Ranch and the Fort McDowell Indian Community was traded to the Fort McDowell Indian Community in exchange for other parcels of value to the Forest Service elsewhere in Arizona. This process took four years to complete.

Small pieces of land can be sold to cities and towns via the Townsite Act.

Potential exists for the addition of land to the TNF:

The Arizona State Land Department, Forest Service, and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) attempted to make a land exchange which would have added approximately 30,000 acres to the TNF in the southern Superstition Mountains area (in exchange for BLM land along Grand Avenue near Wickenburg that ASLD could have sold or leased for development purposes), but the deal fell apart due to the requirement for state and federal enabling legislation.

Areas north of the Anthem Master Planned Community along I-17 may become a part of the TNF in the future.

The development of transportation plans in the TNF also address non-typical transportation network components, such as:

- Trails and trailheads.

- Low use roads for ATVs, motorcycles, mountain bikes, etc.

Other points noted included:

- Partnerships with other agencies are very important (e.g. ASLD, BLM, Arizona Game & Fish, etc.).

- A survey of actual visitation and usage of the TNF is scheduled for 12 months beginning in October 2001.

- The most recent TNF Land Management Plan is from 1985, with the next update scheduled for 2005.

- The Forest Service is most interested in participating in the MAG RTP, thanked us for including them as a regional stakeholder and asked to be kept informed of future project activities.

**Draft Community Meetings Summary
MAG RTP**

| Community | Date of Visit | Local Staff | Current Pop. | Bldg. Out P. | Exist. Corridors | Future Corridors | Exist. Activity Centers | Future Activity Centers | Redev. Areas | Maj. Dev. Influences | Maj. Preserv. Issues | Other Growth Issues |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| Phoenix | 9/6/2001 | Joy Mee | 1,321,045 | 1,800,000 | numerous | 202/South Mtn, LRT, N. Black Canyon, SR74/Carefree Hwy | Downtown, Airport, BlackCanyon, Camelback | North Gateway, I-10/101, West 202, | airport, downtown, around rail stations | new roadway confluences (202/I-10, 101/I-10, 101/I-17), rail stations, airport | open space, air quality, | infill, mobility, air quality, QOL |
| Mesa | 9/5/2001 | Frank Mizner | 396,375 | 638,000 | US 60, 101, 202, Country Club, Main, Grid | 202, Power, "Bush Hwy." LRT, Commuter Rail, | Downtown, Fiesta Mall, Super.Spgs., Falcon Field | GM Proving Grounds, Williams Gateway | Downtown, East Main, 60/202 Confluence | Williams/Gateway, GM. 202&101 extensions | "Desert Uplands" (Power/Univ. area) | Redevelopment/Revitalization, Jobs/Housing balance, Sales Tax |
| Glendale | 9/7/2001 | Ron Short | 211,228 | 305,000 | 101, Glendale, Northern, Grand | 303, Northern "Super Street", LRT, Bell | Downtown, Arrowhead | 101, (Linman) (Coyotes) Project, Manastee Cntr redev. | Downtown, Grand, | 101, "West Area", Luke AFB, 303 | Luke AFB, Downtown Character | Throughput from north/west new development |
| Scottsdale | 9/6/2001 | Don Hadder | 202,705 | 300,000 | 101, Scottsdale Rd, Hayden, Shea | Gilbert Rd, Dynamite, 101, 303 Extension | Downtown, McCormick Ranch Center, Shea/Scotts., | Los Arcos, intensification of existing centers | Downtown, Los Arcos | New activity on SRIC; state lands, 101 corridor | Open Space, McDowell Mtns., ASLD holdings | Affordable Housing near employment centers |
| Tempe | 9/7/2001 | Diana Kaminski | 158,625 | 350,000 | US60, 202, Broadway, | none avail, shift to transit, rail | ASU, CBD, ASU Res.Pk. | Stadium, LRT corridors | Apache Blvd | ASU, Stadium, Rio Salado | downtown | RASP (aviation), throughput pressure on art.& fwy corrs. |
| Chandler | 8/23/2001 | Hank Pluster | 176,581 | 259,000 | 101, Price Rd, Ray, Chandler Blvd., Arizona Ave | 202/SanTan, New Rail Link (LRT and/or Commuter) | Downtown, Price Employment Core, Ray/I-10, Fashion Center Mall | Airpark, Fashion Center Mall | Downtown/CBD | 202/SanTan, Airpark ((link to Scotts. Airpark long employment corridor) | Downtown Character Area | Need to develop airpark, last "economic development frontier" |
| Gilbert | 8/23/2001 | Jerry Swonson | 109,697 | 322,000 | Gilbert Rd., | 202/SanTan, Link to Pinal growth areas, Power Rd, Rail? | Downtown Heritage area | SanTan Corridor, Gilbert Gateway, Power Ranch | Downtown Heritage district | 202/SanTan, Williams Gateway, GM | | links to and throughput from Pinal County growth areas to SE |
| Surprise | 8/24/2001 | Phil Testa | 30,848 | 61,000 | Bell, Grand | 303, Sun Valley Pkwy. Connection | Bell Corridor, Bell/Grand | Employment core around Volvo proving ground | "old town" | Luke AFB, 303, Grand corridors | White Tank Mtns. | new bedroom community, need jobs and services to balance |
| Goodyear | 8/22/2001 | Harvey Krause | 18,911 | 290,000 | I-10, MC85, Litchfield, Estrella | 303, Bullard, Indian School, Estrella, Rail | Litchfield Corridor | Westcor Mall, Estrella | | 303, Westcor site, Luke AFB | Tres Rios project, Luke AFB | create new City Center |
| Avondale | 8/24/2001 | Felipe Zubia | 35,883 | 85,000 | I-10, 101, MC85 | 115th Ave, Rail? | I-10 Corridor, PIR, Van Buran, McDowell | 115th Ave corridor, 99th/Ind. School | downtown area, Cashion | 101 and I-10 corridors | downtown, Tres Rios project | Goodyear/airport impacts |
| Tolleson | 9/17/2001 | Ray Velez | 4,974 | 8,000 | I-10, 101 | "Rio Salado", Commuter rail | limited | | transition to multi-family | I-10 Commercial traffic | N/A | very limited future for housing; land valuable for industrial use |
| Buckeye | 9/4/2001 | Joe Blanton | 6,500 | 1,000,000 | I-10, SR85, MC85 | Sun Valley Pkwy., Riggs, Wickenburg& Vulture Rds | downtown | airport, various PUD community centers | Downtown | I-10, prison | | positioned for "takeoff " |
| Peoria | 9/7/2001 | Debra Stark | 108,364 | 487,000 | 101, Grand, Bell | 303, Lake Pleasant Rd., SR74, Bell, New River Rd. | Bell/Sports Cmplx., Old Town, Grand Gateway | Carefree/Lake Pleasant, North Central (Lake Pleasant Rd), | Old Town | 101, Luke AFB, 303, SR74 | Area N. of SR74, Agua Fria and New Rivers | transition from bedroom community to balanced land use |
| Queen Creek | 8/23/2001 | John Kross | 4,887 | 76,700 | Rittenhouse, Ellsworth, Power | Germann, Queen Cr., Riggs, Vinyard, Hunt | Town Center | Power Corridor, Germann Corr., Town Center, | Town Center | Williams/Gateway, GM | San Tan Park, Agric./Rural Character | relationships to development in and throughput from Pinal |
| Apache Junction | 9/5/2001 | Dean Svoboda | 31,000 | 61,000 | US 60, Idaho, Main | US60 (east), Vinyard | limited | Hospital(US60@G oldfield) Walmart on Main | "trailer parks, non-conforming uses" | State Lands, Williams Gateway, GM, 202/60 confluence spillover | transition: cheap temporary residence to year round city | resolve utility & flood control issues |
| Salt River | 7/26/2001 | Hans Klose | 6,300 | N/A | 101, SR87, McDowell, Longmore | 202/Red Mtn. | Pavilions, Casinos, Pima/Chapparal | 101 and 202 corridors | tribal housing in community core | 101 and 202 freeways | heritage, E-D to offset future gaming | Mesa-Scottsdale throughput traffic |
| Gila River | 7/26/2001 | Dean Weatherly | 14,000 | N/A | I-10, I-8, Maricopa Rd. | Hunt Highway | I-10/Maricopa Rd, Vee Quiva Casino, Sacaton | expansion of existing | housing | San Tan & South Mtn fwys | | Canamex Corridor traffic |
| Ft. McDowell | 8/28/2001 | Norm Phillips | 824 | N/A | SR87, Shea | new "Bush Hwy" connection to East Mesa | Casino, Out of Africa park | 87/Shea intersection, new destination resort | tribal housing in community core | Beeline, Verde River, casino | Verde River, Agricultural area | erosion of market share of gaming, diversify economy |